UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/765,576	01/26/2004	Stephane Coulombe	944-003.214	8150
	7590 07/14/200 OLA VAN DER SLUY	EXAMINER		
BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5			WON, MICHAEL YOUNG	
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224 MONROE, CT 06468			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			2155	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/14/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/765,576	COULOMBE ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
MICHAEL Y. WON	2155		

	MICHAEL Y. WON	2155	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>30 June 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following reapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Claperiods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidav al (with appeal fee) in compliance	it, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the r (3) a Request
The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing.	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	lvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejection	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)) <u>.</u>		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the state forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later that may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount nortened statutory period for reply orig	of the fee. The appropri- inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compli	iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wit AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	ut prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further con	•	TE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better	er form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying t	he issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a α	orresponding number of finally rei	ected claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finding rej	octod oldimo.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		(
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allo		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	·	•	-
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provious The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-47</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	before or on the date of filing a N	otice of Appeal will not	be entered
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	sufficient reasons why the affidav	it or other evidence is	necessary and
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	ercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		-	
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 		n condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (I13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Michael Won/		
	Primary Examiner		
	July 10, 2008		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: in response to the argument with regards to the difference between the reference's teaching of "terminal and/or network capabilities" and the applicant's "media characterisites", the specification throughout merely describes "media characterisites" as to enable "determining whether the message should be transcoded to accommodate the multimedia capabilities of the receiving terminal" (see page 2, lines 28-31). As such Christopoulos (Patent 754') clearly and explicitly teach this broad limitation (see Final Office Action mailed May 23, 2008). Christopoulos further teaches that this information is either provided to the external device (i.e. inserted into the message) or stored (see col.4, lines 8-12). Although the overall invention might be different from the reference, such distinguishing characterisites in terms of functionality must be clearly recited in the pending claims. During patent examination, the pending claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification. See In re Hyatt, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Furthermore, while the claims of issued patents are interpreted in light of the specification, prosecution history, prior art and other claims, this is not the mode of claim interpretation to be applied during examination. During examination, the claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow. See In re American Academy of Science Tech Center, F.3d 2004 WL 1067528 (Fed. Cir. May 13, 2004).